



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/991,766	11/23/2001	Sho Kuwamoto	1281	5315

30748 7590 10/04/2004

INNOVATION PARTNERS
540 UNIVERSITY DRIVE
SUITE 300
PALO ALTO, CA 94301

EXAMINER

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/991,766	Applicant(s) KUWAMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner Laurie Ries	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 8, 11-14, 18, 21-24, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bailey (U.S. Publication 2002/0059278 A1) and Chiang (U.S. Publication 2001/0037490 A1).

As per claims 1, 11, and 21, Bailey discloses a system, computer program product, and method of storing a file and information related to the file and not contained in the file, including receiving information to be contained in the file (See Bailey, Page 4, paragraph 0039, and Figure 2, element 218), receiving information related to the file and not contained in the file (See Bailey, Page 5, paragraph 0039, and Figure 2, element 222), storing the file responsive to the information to be contained in the file received (See Bailey, Figure 2, element 218), and storing in a shadow file different from the file, the information related to the file and not contained in the file (See Bailey, Figure 2, element 222). Bailey does not disclose expressly using a web authoring tool to receive the information. Chiang discloses the use of an HTML editor, which is a web authoring tool. (See Chiang, Page 1, paragraph 0004). Bailey and Chiang are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of

generating electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the web authoring tool of Chiang with the information files of Bailey. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the developer to specify the web application screen layouts that can be embedded into the application programming source code. (See Chiang, Page 1, paragraph 0004).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chiang with Bailey for the benefit of structuring the information to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 11, and 21.

As per claims 2, 12, and 22, Bailey and Chiang disclose the limitations of claims 1, 11, and 21 as described above. Bailey also discloses that the shadow file containing information related to the file is an XML file, which, by definition, contains XML tags. (See Bailey, Page 5, paragraph 0039).

As per claims 3, 13, and 23, Bailey and Chiang disclose the limitations of claims 1, 11, and 21 as described above. Bailey also discloses that the file is an HTML file which, by definition, contains HTML code. (See Bailey, page 4, paragraph 0039).

As per claims 4, 14, and 24, Bailey and Chiang disclose the limitations of claims 1, 11, and 21 as described above. Bailey also discloses receiving a request to open the file and automatically displaying at least a portion of the information related to the file in the shadow file responsive to the request (See Bailey, Figure 3, and Page 5, paragraph 0042).

As per claims 8, 18, and 28, Bailey and Chiang disclose the limitations of claims 1, 11, and 21 as described above. Chiang also discloses that the web authoring tool, or HTML editor, includes at least a portion of Adobe GoLive (See Chiang, Page 1,

Art Unit: 2176

paragraph 0004). Bailey and Chiang are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of generating electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include Adobe GoLive as the web authoring tool or HTML editor disclosed by Chiang and Bailey. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the developer to specify the web application screen layouts that can be embedded into the application programming source code. (See Chiang, Page 1, paragraph 0004). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chiang with Bailey for the benefit of structuring the information to obtain the invention as specified in claims 8, 18, and 28.

Claims 5, 15, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bailey (U.S. Publication 2002/0059278 A1) and Chiang (U.S. Publication 2001/0037490 A1) as applied to claims 1, 11, and 21 above, and further in view of Rosen (U.S. Publication 2002/0135538 A1).

As per claims 5, 15, and 25, Bailey and Chiang disclose the limitations of claims 1, 11, and 21 as described above. Bailey and Chiang do not disclose expressly receiving a request to move the file to a destination and automatically moving at least a portion of the shadow file to the destination responsive to the request. Rosen discloses allowing a user to move related files and automatically moving the related files. (See Rosen, Claims 12 and 14). Bailey, Chiang, and Rosen are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of generating electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the

Art Unit: 2176

moving of related files of Rosen with the system and method of Bailey and Chiang. The motivation for doing so would have been to preserve the illusion of surfing through space which is created when a user navigates between frames of a web display which are populated using the multiple related files. (See Rosen, Page 2, paragraph 0015). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Rosen with Bailey and Chiang for the benefit of maintaining uniformity between frames created by related files to obtain the invention specified in claims 5, 15, and 25.

Claims 6-7, 16-17, and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bailey (U.S. Publication 2002/0059278 A1) and Chiang (U.S. Publication 2001/0037490 A1) as applied to claims 1, 11, and 21 above, and further in view of Guck (U.S. Patent 5,911,776).

As per claims 6-7, 16-17, and 26-27, Bailey and Chiang disclose the limitations of claims 1, 11, and 21 as described above. Bailey and Chiang do not disclose expressly that the shadow file includes a name corresponding to a name of the file, or that the shadow file includes the file name. Guck discloses that a shadow file name can correspond to the name of a source file and can contain the name of the source file. (See Guck, Figure 2A). Bailey, Chiang and Guck are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of generating electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the shadow file names of Guck with the shadow file of Bailey and Chiang. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to only refer to a file by name rather than

Art Unit: 2176

remembering the file extension. (See Guck, Column 8, lines 50-51). Therefore, it would be obvious to combine Guck with Bailey and Chiang for the benefit of allowing the user to disregard the file extension when referring to the file to obtain the invention as specified in claims 6-7, 16-17, and 26-27.

Claims 9-10, 19-20, and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guck (U.S. Patent 5,911,776) and Bailey (U.S. Publication 2002/0059278 A1).

As per claims 9, 19, and 29, Guck discloses a system, computer program product, and method of retrieving a file including HTML and having a filename, which includes retrieving the file (See Guck Column 12, lines 21-24) and retrieving a shadow file having a filename including the filename of the file. (See Guck, Figure 2A). Guck does not disclose expressly that the shadow file contains information about the file. Bailey discloses that the shadow file contains information about the file, such as configuration information. (See Bailey, Page 5, paragraph 0039 and Figure 2, element 222). Guck and Bailey are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of generating electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the information content in the shadow file of Bailey with the shadow file of Guck. The motivation for doing so would have been to define the manner in which the page is to be constructed. (See Bailey, Page 5, paragraph 0039). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bailey

Art Unit: 2176

with Guck for the benefit of providing information to define the page layout to obtain the invention as specified in claims 9, 19, and 29.

As per claims 10, 20 and 30, Guck and Bailey disclose the limitations of claims 9, 19 and 29 as described above. Guck also discloses that the filename of the shadow file can include multiple numbers of other formats (See Guck, Column 7, lines 37-53), including MPEG files which, as is known in the art, have an extension beginning with "m". (See Guck, Figure 8).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Markel (U.S. Patent 6,760,043) discloses a system and method for web based enhanced interactive television content page layout.
- Aizikowitz (U.S. Publication 2002/0049702 A1) discloses a system and method for creating customized documents for cross media publishing.
- Brooke (U.S. Patent 6,748,569 B1) discloses a method for generating XML documents that extends the capabilities of XML.
- Dourish discloses extending document management systems with user-specific active properties.

Art Unit: 2176

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is currently (703) 605-1238.

After mid-October, 2004, the examiner can be reached at (571) 272-4095. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00am to 3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can currently be reached on (703) 305-9792. After mid-October, 2004, the examiner's supervisor can be reached at (571) 272-4090.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER